

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | - • | |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 09/925,336 | 08/09/2001 | Timur Mehmet Momol | UF-258CXC1 | 4420 |
| | 590 04/17/2003 | | | |
| SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION 2421 N.W. 41ST STREET SUITE A-1 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | COE, SUSAN D | |
| GAINESVILLE, FL 326066669 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1654 DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003 | 14 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | 09/925,336 | MOMOL ET AL. | | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | The MAU INC DATE of this area in the | Susan Coe | 1654 | | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1)[| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 M | larch 2003 and 02 April 2003 . | | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This | s action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1 and 13 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 13</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| 7)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | | |
| 8) | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | |
| 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | | | |
| a) 🗌 The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. | | | | | | | | |
| 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/925,336

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 10, 2003 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 2, 6-10, and 14-17 have been cancelled.
- 3. Claims 1 and 13 are currently pending.
- 4. The declaration of Timur Momol, filed March 12, 2003, has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momol et al. (Phytopathology (June 1999), vol. 89, no. 6, pp. S54) in view of US Pat. No. 4,780,471.

Applicant has amended the claims to include ethyl alcohol and a detergent in composition with the thymol. Momol does not teach using these ingredients in combination with the thymol. However, US '471 teaches that ethyl alcohol and surfactants are known carriers for products that are applied to plants (see column 7, lines 1-18). A detergent is a type of surfactant. This

Application/Control Number: 09/925,336

Art Unit: 1654

reference shows it was known in the art at the time of the invention to use ethyl alcohol and detergents in compositions that are applied to plants. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use these carriers in combination with the thymol taught by Momol.

Applicant's arguments regarding the original 103 rejection over Momol are fully considered in light of the new claim amendments. Applicant argues that Momol does not teach using the thymol on field tomatoes, only on greenhouse tomatoes. Applicant contends that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have no way of knowing whether the treatment would actually work in the field. However, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine without undue experimentation if the method taught by Momol on greenhouse tomatoes would be successful in the field. In addition, the artisan of ordinary skill would clearly understand the desirability of using this product to suppress *Ralstonia* associated wilt on field tomatoes because the reference clearly states that the wilt is a problem in field grown tomatoes. Therefore, Momol is still considered to render the claimed invention obvious.

6. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe whose telephone number is (703) 306-5823. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:00 to 5:30 and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached on (703) 306-3220. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Susan Coe, Examiner April 9, 2003

LEON B. LANKFORD, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER